



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,059	01/03/2006	Matias Jonsson	4660-4	1948
23117 7590 06/17/2009 NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203				
EXAMINER				
STORK, KYLE R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2178				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/17/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/563,059

**Applicant(s)**

JONSSON, MATTIAS

**Examiner**

KYLE R. STORK

**Art Unit**

2178

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 April 2009.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 20 and 25-28 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 20 and 25-28 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This final office action is in response to the amendment filed 27 April 2009.
2. Claims 1-7, 20, and 25-28 are pending. Claims 1, 20, and 25 are independent claims.

The rejection of claims 1-6, 20, and 25-28 under 35 USC 102 over Moon et al. (US 6711740, filed 17 January 2002, hereafter Moon) has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

The rejection of claim 7 under 35 USC 103 over Moon and further in view of Yoshida et al. (US 2003/0158854, filed 21 October 2002, hereafter Yoshida) has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-6, 20, and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moon et al. (US 6711740, filed 17 January 2002, hereafter Moon), and further in view of Hind et al. (US 6635088, patented 21 October 2003, hereafter Hind).

As per independent claim 1, Moon discloses a method for compressing a data set to be transmitted from a first application in a first communications network to a second application in a second communications network, said data set having a markup hierarchy and comprising data having parts having first binary size, the data set being arranged according to a definition part, the method comprising the steps of:

Generating a set of codes as a compression key defining said data parts defined in said definition part with codes having a second binary size less than said first binary size, wherein each code relates to a markup name (column 3, lines 31-63; column 5, lines 29-64)

Assigning at least said markup hierarchy with said set of codes (column 3, lines 31-63; column 5, lines 29-64)

Replacing said data parts in the form of said markup names in said data by said assigned codes and producing a compressed data set (column 3, lines 31-63; column 5, lines 29-64: Here, tags contained within the data set are compressed by replacing the tags using selected compression codes from a DTD to generate a compressed data set)

Moon fails to specifically disclose wherein the generated codes comprising short codes for the markup hierarchies defined in the first part to be used to replace the markup texts in the second part and wherein the compressed data set comprises an XML document. However, Hind discloses wherein the generated codes comprising short codes for the markup hierarchies defined in the first part to be used to replace the markup texts in the second part and wherein the compressed data set comprises an XML document (Figures 5A-5B; column 4, lines 42-63; column 12, line 65- column 13,

line 19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Hind with Moon, since it would have allowed the user to compress an XML document.

As per dependent claim 2, Moon discloses wherein the markup hierarchy refer to a reference comprising a second markup hierarchy which are resolved and assigned with codes (column 3, lines 31-63: Here, the DTD is a second hierarchy. The DTD contains the data referenced by the compression codes).

As per dependent claim 3, Moon discloses wherein each code is unique (column 6, lines 62-76).

As per dependent claim 4, Moon disclose wherein each code replaces a markup hierarchy in said data set is assigned a value pointed out by the markup hierarchy (column 5, lines 59-64; column 6, lines 49-61: Here, the values contained in the hierarchy are contained in a DTD, allowing for compression/decompression of the compressed document). Moon fails to specifically disclose wherein the data set is an XML document. However, Hind discloses wherein the compressed document in an XML document (Figure 5A-5B; column 4, lines 42-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Hind with Moon, since it would have allowed the user to compress an XML document.

As per dependent claim 5, Moon discloses wherein a code replacing a markup hierarchy in the data set is assigned a value comprised by a reference pointed out by the markup hierarchy (column 5, lines 59-64; column 6, lines 49-61). Moon fails to specifically disclose wherein the data set is an XML document. However, Hind

discloses wherein the compressed document in an XML document (Figure 5A-5B; column 4, lines 42-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Hind with Moon, since it would have allowed the user to compress an XML document.

As per dependent claim 6, Moon discloses wherein a value pointed out by a markup hierarchy in said data set is one of a limited set of values defined in said data set, where each value is assigned a code that replaces said value in said data set (column 5, lines 59-64; column 6, lines 49-61). Moon fails to specifically disclose wherein the data set is an XML document. However, Hind discloses wherein the compressed document in an XML document (Figure 5A-5B; column 4, lines 42-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Hind with Moon, since it would have allowed the user to compress an XML document.

As per independent claims 20 and 25, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1. Claims 20 and 25 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 26-28, Moon discloses wherein the first unit is any of a mobile station, a mobile phone, a palm size computer, a computer, or similar (column 2, lines 45-52); wherein the first unit is a remote control or monitoring device (column 2, lines 45-52); and wherein the second unit a remote controlled arrangement such as robot, a vehicle, or missile (column 2, lines 45-52).

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moon and Hind and further in view of Yoshida et al. (US 2003/0158854, filed 21 October 2002, hereafter Yoshida).

As per dependent claim 7, Moon and Hind discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 4, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Moon fails to specifically disclose wherein the data set is an XML document. However, Hind discloses wherein the compressed document in an XML document (Figure 5A-5B; column 4, lines 42-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Hind with Moon, since it would have allowed the user to compress an XML document.

Moon fails to specifically disclose wherein data is replaced by a numerical representation. However, Yoshida discloses wherein data is replaced by a numerical representation (paragraph 0031: Here, the result of compression is placed in the XML document in the form of character codes). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Yoshida with Moon, since it would have allowed for compression of data by substituting a result of compressed binary data into the markup file.

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 20, and 25-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **KYLE R. STORK** whose telephone number is (571)272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on **Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30)**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kyle Stork/

Kyle R Stork  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2178

krs